



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Homeri Iliadis carmina, seiuncta, discreta, emendata, prolegomenis et apparatu critico instructa edidit GUILIELMUS CHRIST. Leipsic, 1884, pp. 742.

Homeric study still is, as it always has been, the basis of Greek philology. Editions of Homer, critical and exegetical, are the best milestones to mark the progress, and the best sign-boards to show the course of philological research. If we compare the Aldine editions with Heyne's, that of Heyne with Bekker's of 1843, Bekker's of 1843 with Bekker's of 1858, and that with the last edition which has appeared, we can see marked strides. This is even more distinct if, with reference to the restitution of the digamma, we compare the editions of Payne Knight (and his *Ψαλλον*), Bekker, and Christ. The critic's action is much more precise and scientific at the end of each period than at the beginning; what was guesswork has become in many cases regular and certain.

The edition of Christ stands alone in several particulars. It embraces both higher and lower criticism. Kirchhoff, in 1859, in his *Homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*, divided the Odyssey into what he believed to be its original elements: the original Νόστος of Odysseus (1200 verses), the later continuation (3561 verses), the 41 additions of the later revision (7186 verses), the 6 interpolations of the recension of the Pisistratidae (80 verses). But Kirchhoff expressly disclaimed an attempt at a new recension of the text. That he would be unwilling to proceed as boldly in lower as in higher criticism, is indicated by his regret that Bekker had introduced *F* into the text. Köchly, in 1861, published on Lachmann's principles, but with idiosyncrasies of his own, 16 Lays of the Iliad, *in usum scholarum*, but made few innovations in the text, beyond an occasional omission of one or more verses.

Christ has endeavored not merely to restore the correct words and correct forms to the text, but also to settle the vexed Homeric question. He does not leave us to surmise in each case the reasons for his action, but has prefixed to the text 185 pages of Prolegomena, of which a little more than half are devoted to the discussion of the separation and order of the lays of the Iliad, and the other half to the critical apparatus. He has presented the facts and his principles so clearly that the book is valuable as a compendious statement of the Homeric question, and it is possible to *control* the editor's work. He does not discuss the ancient notices concerning the life of Homer, nor does he treat of the authorship of the Odyssey.

He believes the Iliad to have been completed before the first Olympiad, and to have been committed to writing before the time of Pisistratus, but in separate lays with separate titles. His position with regard to the Iliad resembles strongly that of Kirchhoff with regard to the Odyssey, but is more conservative. He admires greatly Hermann's program on "Interpolations in Homer," and with him recognizes pre-Homeric, Homeric, and post-Homeric elements. With Kirchhoff he would agree that it is impossible to separate the pre-Homeric parts; they have been interwoven with the structure of the new poem. He is

not a follower of Lachmann, although he divides the Iliad into 40 different lays, one occasionally being interjected in another. He ridicules the mosaics which the followers of Lachmann have formed, by taking here and there from widely separated books the parts which they desire to make up a lay, and reminds us how little real independence is possessed by Lachmann's lays. He does not hold the Iliad to be a conglomeration of isolated and independent songs which had formed around a common centre, and thus had mutually affected each other until something like unity was produced. He holds rather to the organic development of the story from a single starting point. He thinks that the greater part of the poem, and especially the last lays, show us a poet revolving in his mind a great plan and arranging the several parts to form a whole. Even the songs which can be removed rest at many points on other songs and narrate a story which is taken up in still other songs. Who can conceive a poet putting into the mouth of Achilles *ἡ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἔξεται νῆας Ἀχαιῶν . . . τότε δ' οὔτι δυνήσσαι κτλ.*—unless the poet intended to follow up this thought? The songs were composed to be sung separately, and thus there are not such minute and exact references to one another as some expect, and the connection is looser than it would be otherwise. But the connection is too close, the allusions of one song to another are too precise, to allow the editor to accept Lachmann's views. The poet had in his mind the definite plan of a cycle of song; he proceeded according to a line which he had laid down to follow. But he made each lay fairly independent, since it was to be sung by itself. The bards and, doubtless, Homer himself, selected for each occasion what would best suit the circumstances, and as time pressed or permitted, would sing one song or a group of songs. Certain parts of the poem are excluded at once as later additions and independent lays: Catalogue of the Ships (in B), Doloneia (K), Hoplopoeia (in Σ), Ἀθλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ (in Ψ), Ἑκτορος λύτρα (Ω); and certain episodes as the *Τειχοσκοπία* (in Γ).

The poems were not composed by Homer and the Homeridae in the order in which they stand in the Iliad. This is evident from a comparison of the parts, as well as natural on the first view of the case. At that age no Greek poet would begin a long poem fixed in every detail. The editor seeks for linguistic indications and for references from one part to another. It is clear from *ἵππους οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην*, θ 108, that E 166-367 (the episode in which Diomed captures the horses and wounds Aeneas) had been composed. The Death of Patroclus might be composed before the Doloneia, but not after the Hoplopoeia. Where a verse which occurs twice can be shown to belong to but one passage, an indication of earlier composition is found; but great caution is necessary in this method of investigation.

I. The first and earliest lay of the Iliad, Christ thinks to be A 1-305, the pestilence, assembly and quarrel, ending

*ὥς τῷ γ' ἀντιβίοισι μαχέσσανμένῳ Φεπέεσσιν  
ἀνστήτην, λῦσαν δ' ἀγορὴν παρὰ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.*

II. The rest of A forms the second song.

III. A 1-595, the Bravery of Agamemnon, beginning

*Ἥως δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο  
ὠρνυθ' ἔν' ἀθανάτοισι φάος φέροι ἡδὲ βροτοῖσιν  
Ζεὺς δ' Ἐριδα προιάλλε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.*

Agamemnon leads forth his forces to fight. They are at first successful (as the Iliad must make the Greeks victorious at least in the first onset), but Agamemnon, Diomed, and Odysseus are wounded and the Achaeans compelled to retreat, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή.

IV. O 592-Π 418, Π 698-863, the Patrocleia, beginning

Τρῶες δὲ λείουσι Φεφουκότες ὠμοφάγοισιν  
νηυσὶν ἐπεσσεύοντο Διὸς δ' ἐτέλειον ἐφετμάς  
. . . Θέτιδος ἐξάϊσιν ἄρην.

V. P 262-761 (with some interpolations), the Bravery of Menelaus.

VI. P 424-542, the Bravery of Automedon, interjected in the previous song.

VII. Σ 1-242, the Rescue of the body of Patroclus.

This was the first sketch of the Iliad, ending

ἦέλιος μὲν ἔδν, παύσαντο δὲ διῖν Ἀχαιοὶ  
φυλόπιδος κρατερῆς καὶ ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο.

In this first sketch are about 2400 verses.

To this were added Books B-E, and afterwards most of the rest (of course considering Θ, I, K, late) to fill up to Λ. Christ attributes to Homer about 9500 verses in all (out of 15,693), or nearly two-thirds, being considerably more liberal than *e. g.* Bergk, who assigns to Homer not more than two-fifths of the Iliad. Furthermore, while he does not believe that his Homer composed the Ἕκτορος λύτρα (Ω), he believes that this was part of the original plan and that Homer died before he finished it, leaving to his companions the completion of his work.

The Old Iliad (the seven lays last enumerated, and Ba, Γ, Δ, E) is printed in large upright type. In large inclined type are printed the portions of the poem in which the camp is represented as entrenched and the Trojan forces as aided by Sarpedon and the Southern Lycians. In small upright type are Hb, Θ, I, Δb, Σb, Tb, Υb, Φb, Ψb. In small inclined type are the Catalogue of Ships, Doloneia, and the last additions. The reader thus sees at a glance the editor's view of any part of the poem. The text is printed in the usual order, with the single exception of the last verses of B, which are placed before the Catalogue. The old lettering and numbering of the books is retained. The new lays are numbered, but no separate numbering is given for their verses.

Besides the different lays, the editor recognizes three epylls or groups of songs, each about as long as the Aethiopis of Arctinus: B-E, M-Θa, Θb-Σa.

As indications of the original lays, Christ takes not only the internal evidence of agreement or discrepancy, and the lines or passages which were used to give a rounded close to a lay, or to state the situation at the beginning of a lay (verses which were not needed when the whole poem was taken in connection); he judges also from the titles, some of which are known to be old. As Herodotus quotes from Διομήδους ἀριστεία, as Plato refers to the Τειχομαχία and Λιταί, as both Plato and Aristotle quote from ἐν Ἀλκίον ἀπολόγῳ, so Aelian has handed down what appears to be an authentic statement of the ancient titles of a number of lays. These names were so fixed in popular use that they were not forgotten as soon as the poems were divided into books and lettered. Christ follows the hints which these titles offer.

The editor gives in considerable detail his views concerning interpolations. He notices the excellent condition of the Homeric text as compared with that of the German Epics. The authority of the Alexandrian grammarians was sufficient to keep out of the best MSS the interpolations of the Roman and Byzantine periods. He does not doubt that most of the verses which were inserted in the text by Pisistratus and the following ages were discovered by Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus. Far from considering the commission of Pisistratus to be the fathers of the poems, the editor does not think that Onomacritus and the rest added or rejected much: they followed usage and the most careful tradition.

Before the poems were committed to writing, the field for interpolations was far freer. As the hymn to Pythian Apollo suffered the interpolation of the story of Typhon (127-177) and as Hesiod's Theogony suffered the interpolation of the hymns to Hecate and the Muses, it is natural to suppose that the Iliad, a much earlier poem, suffered likewise in the course of transmission. In the later ages of the rhapsodists, the interpolations would consist merely in explanations of what seemed obscure; but in earlier times, when the rhapsodes were *aodes*, themselves poets, they doubtless felt inspired to add new episodes or comparisons. Christ sketches the different classes of interpolations, of which he had written more at length elsewhere, such as the additions made to secure a closer connection of the songs, or to explain the situation at the beginning of a lay, or to give a more rounded close at the end of a lay; or interpolations in the earlier lays to prepare the way for the later songs which had been added, as when Ω was added, Ψ 184-191 were inserted to prepare the way for the ransom of Hector's body. The interpolations of the rhapsodes who were themselves poets are much more difficult to detect.

Christ finds three fundamental contradictions in the Iliad as we have it. I. The wall about the camp. II. The Lycians. III. The Scamander.

I. The walls are a basis for the *Τειχομαχία* and *Μάχη παρὰ νηυσίν*, and are mentioned often in Θ, Ι, Ξ, Ο, ΙΙ, Σ, Υ, Ω. But there is no mention of them where it is expected in Δ 47 (only a *trench*), and in ΙΙ 366-370 the fleeing Trojans were hindered by no wall.

II. Christ distinguishes two sets of Lycians—Northern Lycians, neighbors and old allies of the Trojans, under command of Pandarus; and Southern Lycians, commanded by Sarpedon and Glaucus (Ε 479 *τηλόθεν ἴκω· τηλοῦ γὰρ Λυκίῃ Ξάνθῳ ἐπὶ δυνέηντι*). The latter did not belong to the original story; they were added when the Ionians near Southern Lycia (some of whose princes derived their descent from Glaucus) heard the Trojan story and desired to be represented in it. An indication of the later addition is found Ζ 123, where Diomed addresses Glaucus: *τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι, φέριστε, κατανήτων ἀνθρώπων; | οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ὅπωπα μάχῃ ἐνὶ κυδιανείρῃ* (and this in the tenth year of the war). Sarpedon and the rest of his Lycians appear only in certain lays or episodes. It was natural that new heroes should be added as the poem was expanded.

III. Δ 498 both Trojan city and Achaean camp lie on the right bank of the Scamander, while Ξ 432 ff., the river flows between the camp and the city, cf. Η 329, Θ 490, 560, Ψ 242 ff., Ω 350.

As to lower criticism, the first question which arises is whether the editor has been content to strive to establish the Alexandrian text, or has gone back

of Aristarchus. It is only a few years since it was considered impossible to discover what lay before the time of the great critic. Bekker, in 1858, was the first (if we except Payne Knight's rather wild attempt) to endeavor to constitute a text such as the rhapsodes sung; his earlier edition of 1843 gives, perhaps, the most exact view of the traditional text. La Roche, in his critical edition of 1867-76, gives what is essentially the text of Aristarchus, so far as it is known. Nauck, however (1874-77), was more bold than Bekker in the use of conjectural criticism. Bekker restored *F* where it could be done by slight changes; Nauck restored the old dative-ending in *-σι* to the first and second declensions, but did not restore *F* to the text, although he removed the γέ's, ῥά's, *v*-movables, etc., which had been inserted to fill the gap made by the loss of *F*. In some points Christ is more conservative than Nauck, *e. g.* he thinks it unadvisable to restore everywhere the dative-ending *-σι*, but he prints *F* not only at the beginning of simple words, and at the beginning of the second part of a compound, but also ἀφέξετο, κλέφος, ἔχεφεν.

After Fick's attempt at turning the Homeric poems into the Aeolic dialect, unwonted interest is felt in an editor's treatment of dialectic forms. Christ, however, had made clear his position in a review of Fick's *Odyssey* in the *Philologischer Anzeiger*. Christ said that Fick's view that the older songs were composed in the Aeolic dialect and transferred to the Ionic dialect after the Homerids had emigrated from Aeolic Smyrna to Ionic Chios, had been alluring at first sight, but the hypothesis had been buried by the edition of the *Odyssey*. The oldest lays, *e. g.* the single combat of Γ and the Ἀριστεία of Δ, might be Aeolic, but Fick turns even the Telemachia and Theoclymenus-episode into Aeolic. Not one-fifth of the Homeric poems would be later than these. Is it to be supposed that this later Ionic fifth drew all the earlier portions over into the Ionic dialect? This would be contrary to all analogy. The most important external argument for Fick's theory, Christ holds to be the mention by Ephorus of Bolissus (Homer's reputed home in Chios) as an Aeolic town. Christ rebukes Fick for discarding verses because of disagreement with his theory and for violent emendations, also for introducing only initial *F*. But Christ approves of ἰσσοις, ἰσσασι κτλ. for ἰσος, ἰσασι, and adds a note to the second part of his edition to say that he would restore throughout the text ἄμμες, ὑμμες κτλ., but is less certain of μάν for μῆν, ἰμεναι for ἰέναι. On the analogy of ἐρεβεννός, ἀργεννός, ἔννοσίγαιος, he would restore φαεννός, κελαθεννός, ἐνναφετές, ἐννοσίφυλλος κτλ. (and thus would make the Homeric text with its various constituents more consistent than the text of Pindar has yet been constituted).

Christ takes no partisan position with the admirers of Aristarchus or Zenodotus. He introduces into the text πολῦς, A 559 (the reading of Zenodotus, for πολέας); but leaves in the critical apparatus οἰώνοισι τε δαῖτα A 5; although this is sustained not merely by the authority of Zenodotus, but also by the imitation of Aesch. Supp. 801 (764), and by the apparent allusions of Sophocles and Euripides. He reads with Zenodotus, εἶο for εἶος, δένδρει, Γ 152; στενάχοντα, N 423; Πουλλίδαμαν, M 231; κρατερόν, Σ 477; ἀρχησι, Υ 138; ἀποτμήξειε, Σ 34; ἀγγελίην, O 640; but ἀλαοσκοπίην, K 515 (ἀλαὸν σκοπίην, Zen.) He reads against Aristarchus also εἶπες, A 106; κατ' ἀκρηθεν, Π 548; but ὅς κε φάγησι, Φ 127, with Aristarchus.

That he is not unwilling to accept conjectural emendations is shown by

A 18, where he introduces into the text Bentley's conjecture ἕμμι θεοὶ μὲν δοῖεν (which Nauck leaves among the footnotes). So he reads with Ahrens, Γ 3, ἦντε περ κλαγγὴ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρῶ (instead of πρὸ); this again Nauck had left at the bottom of the page. A 15, he reads with Nauck, χρυσέω ἄν σκήπτρῳ. In E 638, ἀλλ' οἶόν τινά φασι βίην 'Ηρακλείην, he reads ἀλλοῖον with Tyrannio, Bekker, Nauck (against Aristarchus and the rest). But, T 107, he reads ψευστήσεις, with Aristarchus and the MSS, not ψεύστης εἰς.

He reads Δύκαστον, B 647 (with Aristarchus), although the people of the place said Λυκάστος, but Καρησός, M 20 (against Aristarchus, but with the Cyzicenes of the Alexandrian time). So he varies from Aristarchus in reading θαμειαί, A 52; ταφείαι, T 357; πτέρυγος, B 316; πεφύοντα, Π 827 (against all MSS, Düntzer, Faesi). In all these points of accentuation (except Καρησός, which is, perhaps, a misprint, for τέ follows, and the corrector may have thought one accent enough for the name), he agrees with Bekker's 1858 edition, as well as in τῶ (τῷ, La Roche), ἡ θέμις ἐστίν, τιμῆς, I 605 (τιμῆς, La Roche, Nauck). He writes Τρῳάς, E 461 (with La Roche, Nauck—Τρῳας, Bekker), θνησκον, A 383 (with Nauck), γινώσκω, E 815 (with Nauck—γινώσκω, Bekker and La Roche). He does not follow Ven. A in reading τῆνδε, τοῦσδε, ἀλα δέ κτλ. He admits elision at the close of the verse, Θ 206 (with Düntzer and La Roche, against all other modern editions). He has kept the acute accent on oxytones at the end of the verse. He is not so determined as Nauck to introduce the diaeresis wherever it is possible. He reads κούλος, θείος, but 'Ηρακλείη. He calls attention to the excess of synizesis in the ordinary text of the poems, and to the ease with which much of this may be removed, as A 1, Πηληιάδα' Ἀχιλλῆος (where he was preceded by Payne Knight's ΠηλεΨιάδαΨ'), but does not introduce this into the text; nor does he write the genitive of the second declension in -οο for -οῦ or -οιο, except where it is demanded, not merely desired, by the verse. So he writes δΨέος, but δεῖδω (not δεῖδια or δέδΨια). His critical apparatus is based upon that of La Roche.

This edition gives us, then, a conservative, conciliating view of the composition of the Homeric poems with a text which makes the various layers clear at a glance, with convenient references to passages where verses are repeated, and with a critical apparatus which is sufficient for ordinary work. In both higher and lower criticism it is probable that the editor's procedure will seem too conservative for the more advanced, and too radical in its changes and views for those who do not go back of Aristarchus. A large number of scholars, however, will enjoy the material which is here gathered, and will approve in the main of the editor's position and course.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

---

Beitraege zu einer Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache, von DR. KARL KRUMBACHER. Weimar, 1884.

Germanic philology, by the genius and industry of Jacob Grimm, was supplied, almost at the outset, with a history of its subject; for his "Deutsche Grammatik," of which the four volumes appeared between 1819 and 1837, was virtually an organic history of the Germanic tongues. The special "Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache" appeared in 1848. It is no matter for surprise if